



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/659,695

09/10/2003

Scott A. Abfalter

94022.8300

7542

20322 7590 10/21/2008
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. (Main)
400 EAST VAN BUREN
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202

EXAMINER

WANG, JUE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2193

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/659,695	Applicant(s) ABFALTER ET AL.	
	Examiner JUE S. WANG	Art Unit 2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JUE S. WANG. (3) ____.

(2) Marc Hennessee (Reg No. 62,659). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Simionescu et al. (2003/0084337).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Hennessee explained what he believed to be the difference between the invention and Simionescu. Examiner stated that she will take Mr. Hennessee's explanation into consideration when reviewing the actual amendments to highlight the differences between the invention and Simionescu. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jue S Wang/ Examiner, Art Unit 2193	/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193
---	---